MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
4 June 1968
INDEX

ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting 1

2. Approval of Minutes of April 1968 meeting 1

3. Expiration of term of Mario E. Campioli as member of Board of Architectural Consultants 1

4. Policy Decision 1

LEGISLATION

S.2230-Bureau of the Budget Request-90th Congress 1

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20, Maryland Avenue, 6th and 7th Streets, S.W. 2

b. Proposed Building across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks 2

c. L'Enfant Plaza - West Building 2

2. General Services Administration

a. Proposed Area Study adjacent to Forrestal Building and South Agriculture Department Building 3

b. Dormitory Building, Gallaudet College 3

c. Philadelphia Mint - Selection of Artists for Proposed Sculpture 3

3. Department of the Navy

Dispensary and Dental Clinic, Bolling/Anacostia 3

d. Watergate Project, Building #1, Stage 5 6

e. SL 68-54, 3908 Shoemaker St., N.W. 6

INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency and General Services Administration

a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in Southwest Washington 7

b. Proposed Building across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks 7

c. Proposed Area Study adjacent to the Forrestal Building and Agriculture Department by GSA 7

d. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building 8

2. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. SL 68-57, Apartment Building townhouses, Maine Ave. 8

b. American Institute of Architects-Revised Design of Headquarters Building 8

c. Watergate Project, Building #1, Stage 5 8

3. Department of the Army, Office of Chief of Support Services 9

Arlington Cemetery Guard Shelters 9

4. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of Acquisitions 9

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 4 June 1968. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 9:48 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
Chloethiel Woodard Smith
John Walker

Staff: C. H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald B. Myer, Asst.Secretary
Myra Younker, Editor

Reporter: Alice Chiang
Tom Stout

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting

Tuesday - Wednesday, 17-18 September 1968 were approved.

2. Approval of Minutes of April 1968 meeting

The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Expiration of term of Mario E. Campioli as member of Board of Architectural Consultants for OG Act, 4/26/68.

Mr. Campioli was reappointed to the Board of Architectural Consultants.

4. Policy Decision (Added)

The members agreed that the transcript of public sessions only would be available to parties interested in a specific project. Transcripts of both sessions would be available to a member who had withdrawn from the meeting during the discussion of his project.

III. LEGISLATION

S. 2230-Bureau of the Budget Request-90thC

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns

removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum. EXHIBIT A

The Secretary commented that the Commission had previously opposed similar legislation and had recommended that a master plan be developed for the entire Arboretum.

The members confirmed their previous action.

IV. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

The Secretary presented and reviewed the following projects.

1. Redevelopment Land Agency

The following projects were considered in relation to each other and to the total area involved. The members had previously decided that the programs for the area proposed by RLA, GSA and the L'Enfant Plaza Corporation should be coordinated before any firm commitment was made on an individual project. Models and photographs of the area, site plan and elevation drawings, as well as schematic sketches of the projects, were submitted.

a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20, Maryland Avenue, 6th and 7th Streets, S.W. Robert Venturi, architect.

The members confirmed their previous disapproval of the siting and design of the proposed building. Two alternative schemes reflecting the members' comments were submitted. They commented on the difficult problem and remarked that the RLA rules governing the design should have been more generalized.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

b. Proposed Building across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks adjacent to east side of 10th Street Mall, FOB 5, and L'Enfant Plaza - Preliminary Site Study. Chloethiel Woodard Smith and Associates Architects. Mrs. Smith withdrew from the room.

The members discussed the density of the area and agreed that this particular site should be kept free of any large buildings. They commented that an underground structure, possibly for parking facilities, would be more appropriate and provide an open space on the level of Tenth Street. The Maryland Avenue Vista of the Capitol from the Tenth Street Mall would be uninterrupted.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

c. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building - Revised Design of End Elevation. Vlastimil Koubek, architect.

The members approved the design revised as they had recommended - the end elevation repeated the design of the front and rear elevations.

A conference with the architect was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Proposed Area Study adjacent to Forrestal Building and South Agriculture Department Building - Preliminary Study by GSA Staff.

A model indicated a long, narrow building for the site east of the Agriculture Department. The members considered the preliminary study in relation to the above projects submitted by RLA. Comments were made concerning the width of the structure and the site. They appreciated knowing that master planning had been initiated for the area.

No specific action was necessary since the project is in a preliminary phase. The members favored the direction the study was taking.

b. Dormitory Building, Gallaudet College - Proposed Design. John S. Samperton and William Procopiow Associated Architects.

A model and drawings indicated that the roof design had been revised as the members had recommended. The strong, horizontal fascia was replaced by a high parapet wall which would screen the mechanical equipment on the roof and carry through the vertical feeling of the facade.

c. Philadelphia Mint - Selection of Artists for Proposed Sculpture

The Commission reviewed photographs of the work of William Daley, Marshall Fredericks and Bruce West for the selection of an artist for a wall-hung, three-dimensional metallic sculpture to be placed in the main lobby of the building. The members decided to discuss the selection with Mr. Yasko of General Services Administration, later.

During the discussion, Mr. Yasko stated that the architect preferred William Daley. Mr. Roszak remarked that a more competent sculptor should be selected. He was authorized by the members to submit informally to Mr. Yasko a list of sculptors qualified to design art work for Federal Office Buildings.

3. Department of the Navy

Dispensary and Dental Clinic, Bolling/Anacostia - Proposed Design. Fisher, Nes, Campbell and Partners, architects-engineers.

A model and drawings indicated that the design had been adjusted to

the master plan. The members thought the roof design appeared contrived and recommended that the canopy feature be omitted.

The Commission's approval and recommendation were forwarded to the Department of the Navy. XXXXXXXXXX

4. Department of the Army, Office of Chief of Support Services

a. Arlington Cemetery Guard Shelter, Reconsideration of Design. Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, architects

The architect requested that the members restudy their recommendations which included a simplified design and more permanent material. The members withheld comments until a conference with the architect later.

b. Proposed Lighting of National Memorial Amphitheater, Arlington Cemetery - Informal Inquiry (American Legion).

The American Legion proposed lighting the Memorial Amphitheater for ceremonies on Veteran's Day, November 11th. They thought the plan might become permanent rather than for the specific occasion only.

The members had no objection to temporary lighting of the Amphitheater. Mr. Sasaki suggested that should the plan become permanent, the Legion should secure the services of a lighting consultant.

The Commission's views were reported to the Department of the Army.
EXHIBIT B

c. Proposed Planting, Arlington National Cemetery, Confirmation of Previously Approved Plans. Sasaki, Dawson, DeMay Associates, Landscape Architects.

The project was submitted to record the Commission's previous approval of the landscape plan for the Cemetery which was identical to the approved Master Plan.

5. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Bridge, Southern Avenue over Suitland Parkway

A model and rendering indicated a steel, orthotropic structure with an open railing. Lighting, if required, will be along the railing. The members approved the design.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Department of Highways and Traffic. EXHIBIT C

6. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Capitol East Playground and Natatorium - Revised Design. Eugene A. Delmar and James F. Hilleary, architects.

The members approved the revised design which incorporated their recommendations as indicated in the material submitted for review.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT D

7. D.C. Government, Office of Beautification

Public Library - Planting Street Trees

The members recommended that the architect be consulted on plans for street trees along the library. Whatever plan he specified they would approve.

Swimming Pool, Junior Village - Proposed Site Plan. Edward D. Stone, Jr., landscape architect.

The Commission approved the proposed site for the swimming pool as indicated in the drawings.

8. Treasury Department, Bureau of the Mint

Proposed Medal Commemorating the 250th Anniversary of the Founding of San Diego.

Disapproving the design, the members again discussed the poor quality of designs for medals. Recording the Commission's disapproval of the designs may help to eventually overcome the problem.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Bureau of the Mint. EXHIBIT E

9. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Old Georgetown Act

Appendix 2

There were no objections to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT F

Shipstead-Luce Act

a. Appendix 1

There were no objections to recommendations by the staff on the Shipstead-Luce Applications listed on Appendix 1. EXHIBIT G

b. S.L. 68-57, 901 thru 947-6th St., S.W., Apartments and Town Houses. Chloethiel Woodard Smith, architect.

The Commission approved plans for townhouses facing the waterfront and highrise apartments as depicted on the model and in the drawings.

The Commission's approval was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

c. American Institute of Architects - Revised Design of Headquarters Building. Mitchell and Giurgola, architects.

A model and drawings indicated that the problem of the intersection of the two wings had not been resolved satisfactorily. The motifs of office and special use floors were clearly stated.

The members felt the design had not progressed as they had anticipated. They thought that the design might be more appropriate if the "notch" where the two wings joined, were eliminated.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect and officials of the AIA later.

d. Watergate Project, Building #1, Stage 5, next to Kennedy Center - Revised Design, Luigi Moretti, architect, and Corning, Moore, Elmore and Fischer, coordinating architects.

Drawings indicated that the building had been relocated on the site near the Kennedy Center. Spandrels replaced the balconies which are a prominent feature on other buildings of the complex. The building was planned for offices rather than apartments.

The members decided to discuss the plan with representatives of the Watergate Development later. Action was withheld until then.

e. S.L. 68-54, 3908 Shoemaker St., N.W. - Brick Residence - Wilfrid V. Vorland, architect.

Two houses, 4 stories, were planned for the area adjacent to Pierce Mill house. Although the design would harmonize with houses of the neighborhood in the direction of the Shoreham Hotel, it would contrast with the pre-fab type house near the Mill.

The members approved the plan and recommended that additional trees

be planted.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

V. Interviews

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency and General Services Administration

General Quesada (L'Enfant Plaza Corporation, Mr. Stanley Sherman (RLA), and Karel Yasko (GSA) attended the meeting during the discussion of the following projects.

a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in Southwest Washington. Mr. Robert Venturi, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Venturi defended his design by explaining in detail the philosophy of his concept. Attempting to prove his design appropriate for the site he compared it to old and new architectural landmarks and their sites within world capitals. He emphasized that the building should not be "one simple shape" as the members had recommended.

Mr. Sasaki noted and illustrated conflicts between Mr. Venturi's stated philosophy and elements of his design. Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Bunshaft restated the Commission's disapproval of the proposed design which the members considered ordinary. The transcripts of the discussion are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT H

b. Proposed Building across Maryland Ave. Railroad Tracks adjacent to east side of 10th St. Mall, FOB 5, and L'Enfant Plaza - Preliminary Site Study - Mr. Holmes represented the architect. Mrs. Smith withdrew from the room.

Mr. Sherman, in reply to Mr. Sasaki's request for RLA requirements for the site, stated that the site was commercial and could have a 90-foot building covering sixty-percent of the area. Mr. Holmes commented on the problem of the site which had been reduced and was now considered too small.

Mr. Bunshaft spoke for the members and stated that the site should be landscaped. A building should be constructed below the level of Tenth Street to permit an uninterrupted view of the Capitol along Maryland Avenue.

c. Proposed Area Study adjacent to the Forrestal Building and Agriculture Department by GSA.

Mr. Yasko briefly explained the project based on a feasibility study of the area. He did not believe the members' recommendation, that the building should be wider, would impose a problem.

The Commission favored the direction the study was developing.

d. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building - Proposed Design

Interview was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

2. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections.

a. S.L. 68-57, Apartment Bldg. townhouses, Maine Ave., S.W.

Interview was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

b. American Institute of Architects - Revised Design of Headquarters Building

Mr. Mills and Mr. Scheik, representing the AIA, and Mr. Giurgola, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Mills commented that the submitted design "had been considered approved by the Headquarters Committee."

Mr. Giurgola briefly explained the changes and stated that the building would be concrete.

Mr. Sasaki, speaking for the members, remarked that the problem of the "center slit was still not resolved." He offered several suggestions which he thought might simplify the design and give greater continuity to it.

After the representatives of AIA and Mr. Giurgola left the meeting, the members continued the discussion. They unanimously agreed to disapprove the design on the basis of the notch.

Transcripts of the discussion are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT I

The Commission's disapproval was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

c. Watergate Project, Bldg. #1, Stage 5, next to Kennedy Center - Revised Design

Mr. Salgo representing the Watergate Developers attended the meeting.

The controversy over the site was reviewed briefly by Mr. Salgo who explained the relocation of the building on the site and the change in its use from apartments to offices. He mentioned that the spandrels with a "railing motif" replaced the balconies.

The Commission approved the site, mass and design, in general, and

requested that the "railing motif" be omitted. Details will be submitted before final approval is granted.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

3. Department of the Army, Office of Chief of Support Services

Arlington Cemetery Guard Shelters - Reconsideration of Design. Mr. Lethbridge attended the meeting.

According to Mr. Lethbridge the structure's "garden-landscaped oriented" design, stained shingle material, and hexagonal shape were considered inconspicuous. The shelters, as proposed, could be easily moved.

Mr. Bunshaft suggested that a "demountable" structure with "partition" type walls and a small flat roof should be considered. The reflection of the grass and sky in glass walls might make the structure more inconspicuous than the proposed design was considered.

Disapproving the proposed design, the members had confidence in the architect and knew a satisfactory solution would be found.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of the Army.

4. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of Proposed Acquisitions

In accordance with custom the Commission visited the Freer Gallery of Art to inspect Oriental works of art proposed for purchase.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Jan Dec. O.B.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

NOV 17 1967

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer
National Capital Planning Commission
The Commission of Fine Arts

SUBJECT: The Department of Agriculture's proposed report on S. 2130, a bill "To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum."

The Bureau of the Budget would appreciate receiving the views of your agency on this subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President.

(x) In order to permit expeditious coordination and clearance in accordance with Circular A-19, it is requested that your reply be made within thirty (30) days.

( ) Special circumstances require that this be handled as a priority matter and that your views be received

Questions should be referred to Russell McGregor Bureau of the Budget, code 103, extension 4720 .

James F. C. Hyde, Jr.
For Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference

Enclosures
Copy of proposed report

Exhibit A

July 26, 1968

Dear Colonel Shaunessey:

As I believe you already know, the Commission of Fine Arts informally discussed the proposed lighting of the Memorial Amphitheater at its meeting on June 4th. While there was some doubt as to how effective and suitable this lighting would be, the Commission expressed no objection to trying it out on a temporary basis. It was also urged that the lighting equipment be provided with rheostats so that the brightness can be adjusted. Of course, the Commission would like to see a demonstration of the lighting before taking any final action. Our next meeting is scheduled to be held on September 17th, and we would be glad to make the inspection at that time.

I might add that when the project was presented to the Commission on the 4th, it was not understood that any lighting would be in the area of the Tomb itself, and that only the Memorial Amphitheater was to be illuminated. The members may have an entirely different reaction to this aspect of the project.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Colonel C. A. Shaunessey, Jr.
Chief of Support Services
Department of the Army
Washington, D. C. 20315

Exhibit B

July 17, 1968

Dear Mr. Airis:

This is merely to confirm the Commission of Fine Art's approval at its meeting on June 4th of the design of the Southern Avenue Bridge over Suitland Parkway in Southeast Washington. We were delighted to see that lighting, if necessary at all, will be restricted to units integrated with the design of the handrail.

We also urge that the steel be painted gray and not green like so many of the bridges constructed by the Park Service.

By direction of the Chairman

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
Director of Highways
D. C. Department of
Highways and Traffic
406 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

Exhibit C

July 12, 1968

Dear Mr. Blaser:

This is merely to confirm approval by the Commission of Fine Arts of the Capital East Natatorium on North Carolina Avenue and 'C' Street S.E. The action was taken at our meeting on June 4.

In approving the design, the members stressed the need for particular care in detailing the various materials since excessive moisture and temperature differences typical of this type facility could cause severe staining. Under no circumstance would the Commission recommend the application of plastic-base paints on the exterior concrete of a new building.

By direction of the Chairman,

C. Atherton

Mr. James Blaser, Director
D.C. Department of Buildings and Grounds
300 Indiana Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C.

July 12, 1968

Dear Miss Adams:

On June 4th the Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for a proposed medal commemorating the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

We are returning the designs without comment for the reason that in the past, when comments have been made by the Commission, they have for the most part been ignored.

It is true that the Executive order requiring submission of medal designs to the Commission does not legally require the Mint to follow the advice of the Commission. But it also is true that other agencies submitting designs under this same executive order do not regard the process as a mere formality, and follow the advice of the Commission.

In any case it is regrettable that the Federal Government, through the office of the Mint, becomes party to such inferior works of art. It is an unfair reflection on a country which has a wealth of artistic talent, and a sad commentary on a government which appears to make little use of it.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

By direction of the Chairman

Honorable Eva Adams
Director, Bureau of the Mint
Treasury Department
Washington, D.C.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS MAY 3 1968

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
Inf. 189	3345 M St., NW Eagle Liquor Store	Relocate exist. non-conforming sign. 1 s-f, 99½ sq-ft sign.

ACTION: The Comm. urges the removal of non-conforming sign & replacement with one of suitable design. If thi is legally not enforceable, we urge that the exist. sign be so modified as to eliminate the arrows on the end the panel. Also mount the sign flush with the face of the bldg., 4/26/68.

193	1691-34th St., NW Gerard Gaussen	Addn. of basem., 1st & 2nd fl. wing at back of main house & new roof over accessory bldg. on property. New swimming pool & interior garden wall changes.

ACTION: No obj., 4/26/68.

196	1805 Wisc. Ave., NW Riggs Nat'l. Bank	Build new 20' wide X 100.33' addn. to right side of exist. bldg. & remodel entire front of bldg.

ACTION: Not recom'd. See previous action on OG 68-148, MAY 3 1968

199	1075 Thos. Jeff. St., NW Georgetown Manor Restaurant	2 schemes for proposed sign. Scheme "A" & "B".

ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest simpler design more typical of early American tavern signs, MAY 3 1968

202	3146 Dumbarton St., NW S. Levy & J. Snyder, Jr.	Erect 2-story brick store bldg. Also brick sample: L. C. Smith, Inc. Locher 8" Williamsburg, straw.

ACTION: No obj., subj. to on-site approval of sample panel of brick wall, 4/26/68.

Inf. 203	1329 & 1333 Wisc. Ave., NW Georgetown Grill	Remove exist. metal siding on front, replace with 4" face brick

ACTION: Not recom'd. Character of elevation unsuitable. Suggest restudy of window & door openings, MAY 3 19

Exhibit F

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
204	3259 P St., NW Col. Russell Skinner	Increase size of kitchen & install lavatory on 1st fl.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 4/24/68.	
205	3236 M St., NW Clyde's Restaurant	Alteration - new doors.
ACTION:	No obj., 4/26/68.	
206	2928 M St., NW Chichies Poodle Pub	1 s-f, 6 sq-ft, black & white sign.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Suggest a simple classical letter with appropriate serifs, MAY 3 1968	
207	2901 M St., NW Theodore & Jas. Pedas	1-story commercial bldg.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Revised study unacceptable. Suggest further study utilizing series of arched openings based on a simple symmetrical form, MAY 3 1968	
208	1545 Wisc. Ave., NW Humble Oil & Ref. Co.	Replace exist. exterior serv. sta. lighting with new colonial type light. on pump islands & new colonial type flood-lighting.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Fixture poorly scaled and proportioned, and not of an appropriate character, MAY 3 19	
209	1332-29th St., NW Mrs. M. de Montaudouin	Brick addn. - side & rear...revised plans.
ACTION:	No obj. to design of door. Recom. that false wooden jack arches on old house be eliminated. Also request further consideration of kitchen roof deck & access door, 4/26/68.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS MAY 17 1968

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
197	3220 Prospect St., NW Doggett's Parking, Inc.	Install 5 light fixtures on exist. pipe standard at ctr. of lot All rays to be confined to parking lot.
ACTION: No obj. as tempo. security lighting, 5/9/68.		
201	3344 M St., NW American Security & Trust Co.	Remove exist. showwindows. Install windows, doors & brick up exist. opening.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Proposal is out of character with bldg. & the OG area, MAY 17 1968		
210	3101 M St., NW Fred Astaire Dance Studio	1 s-f, 24.6 sq-ft sign flat against bldg. Illuminated.
ACTION: See previous action on OG 68-150, 5/9/68.		
211	1258 Wisc. Ave., NW Bishop Equip. Co., Inc.	Remove exist. store front at no. end of bldg. Erect 2' wide, 8" CMU, stucco faced wall, forming entr. vestibule. Install 36x70x1-3/4 stair entr. door to match exist. store entr's. This door is located 5' inside face of bldg.
ACTION: No obj., provided colors are subm'd. for app'l. Effort at harmonizing the colors & trim on this bldg. is strongly recom'd., 5/9/68.		
212	1659-34th St., NW Edward Orlandini	Install 1 light fixture at front entr.
ACTION: No obj., but would prefer a slightly larger fixture, 5/9/68.		
213	1227 Wisc. Ave., NW E. Stuart Lyddane	New store front & relocation of exist. bar.
ACTION: No obj. provided clr. scheme for bldg. is subm'd. & doors are restudied. Recom. 6-panel doors, 5/9/68.		

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
214	1332-29th St., NW Mrs. M. de Montaudouin	Brick addn. - side & rear. Revised plans.

ACTION: Recom'd. Erect sample panel of selected brick & mortar on site for approval. Also request subm. of work-drawings prior to issuance of permit, 5/3/68.

215	2901 M St., NW T. & J. Pedas	Build 1-story commercial bldg.

ACTION: Ret'd. for further study. See attached ltr. dtd. 5/10/68 to Ch., Permit Branch, 5/10/68.

216	2715 Penna. Ave., NW American Oil Co.	Build new brick garden type walls. Remove old paint from exist. brick. Build new vending machine enclosure.

ACTION: Recom'd. prov. gutter on vending machine enclosure is extended to all 4 sides. Relocate downspouts near rear of structure, 5/9/68.

200	1644-31st St., NW Armistead Peter	5' chain-link fence plus 3 strands of barbed wire.

ACTION: Recom'd. Suggest add'l. informal planting near intersection of two fences, 5/13/68.

May 10, 1968

Dear Mr. Beemer:

The Board of Architectural Review considered the design submitted under application OG 68-215 at its meeting on May 9th.

While several details were discussed with the architect, it should be made clear that this project is still far from satisfactory as a total design and involves more than the alteration of a few specific elements before approval can be granted.

To put it in simple terms, the designs so far considered lack appropriate character and scale.

We suggested as we have in the past that the architect make a fresh start, by way of rough sketches, on other approaches to the design. This should involve more than additional overlays of different facade treatments on the existing volume.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. John R. Beemer
Chief, Permit Branch
108 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 6/4/68

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
217	2918 M St., NW Pierre Gaunoux	Replace exist. twin window by a 3-sash window.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/28/68.	
218	1075 Thos. Jeff. St., NW Georgetown Manor	Install 2 wall fixtures at main entr. to lobby. Fixtures to be approx. 6' above ground.
ACTION:	Ret'd. for size of proposed fixtures.	Also suggest fixture of simplified design, 5/15/68.
219	3421 M St., NW Int'l. Art Outlet, Inc.	1, 12 sq-ft painted sign, s-f. Black ltrs. on white bckgd.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/28/68.	
221	1694-32nd St., NW Mr & Mrs Dan Hackel	Replace exist. door & window on west wall of 1st fl. dining rm with a pair of French doors with sidelites.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/28/68.	
222	1320-30th St., NW Jas. J. Manogue	Replace exist. cedar fence with same type cedar wood fence in rear of bldg. Approx. 6'.
ACTION:	No obj., provided structural supports	face inside on private property, 5/28/68.
223	2928 M St., NW Earl Koger (Commercial)	1 s-f, 6 sq-ft sign. Black ltrs. on white bckgd.
ACTION:	No obj., 5/28/68.	

APPENDIX 2

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
224	1698-32nd St., NW Mrs Chas. Murphy ACTION: No obj., 5/28/68.	Install 2 flood lights on rear of house.
225	3277 Prospect St., NW David Fritzlan ACTION: No obj., 5/28/68.	Add 2nd fl. rear addn. for new bedrm.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS JUL 1 1968

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
220	3116 "O" St., NW Christ Episcopal Church	Alterations to external entr. steps & adjacent walk on east side of rectory.
ACTION:	No obj. Submit working drawings & details as they are developed, 6/18/68.	
226	1618-29th St., NW Nan & Lucia Hollerith	5' cedar sapling fence.
ACTION:	No obj. if square corner is substituted for chamfered corner next to tree, 6/20/68.	
227	3144 M St., NW Rosslyn Loan Co., Inc.	Furnish & install rolling slat shutter over storefront & rear entr.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Character of proposed device is unusitable for the Old Georgetown area, JUL 1 1968	
228	3406 Q St., NW Mr & Mrs Ernest Sturc	Extend exist. entr. by revising entr. door.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 6/18/68.	
229	1815 Wisc. Ave., NW Shrader Sound, Inc.	Move sign from prev. address (2803 M St.) to new address.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 6/18/68.	
230	1613-30th St., NW Mrs Nancy B. Reuter	Replace wood constr. of exist. porch with steel, with no change in dimensions. Provide trash chute.
ACTION:	No obj., 6/18/68.	

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
231	1073 Wisc. Ave., NW John R. Wilbraham	Alter 1st fl. front window & block up one window.
ACTION: Recom. restudy without heavy wood window head & 3 horizontal muntins rather than 2, 6/18/68.		
232	1685-35th St., NW Richard Greene	Constr. brick ret. wall 38" in front. Constr. stockade fence 5'-6" on top of 18" brick wall in rear. Constr. brick front steps.
ACTION: No obj. to fence. Resubm. neat, accurate, scale drawings showing more exact details of front stoop & railing designs. Photo & drawings do not match, 6/18/68.		
233	3144 M St., NW Georgetown Sales	2 signs. 21 sq-ft total. Install raised plastic ltrs. to painted out glass wall.
ACTION: No obj., 6/18/68.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

AUG 2 1968

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
234	3217 "O" St., NW Hyde Elem. School	Remodel playground.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that warm color exposed aggregate is used in exterior concrete work. Request erection of sample material on site for inspection, 7/22/68.

235	3800 Reservoir Rd., NW Georgetown U.	Const. addn. to exist. electrical equipm. rm. of same material as exist. bldg. Erect addn. to Georgetown U. Hospital to house add'l. stairways on each end of hospital bldg.

ACTION: No obj. to electrical equipm. rm. addn. No obj. to add'l. stairway enclosures on each end of hospita bldg., provided that side windows are omitted & that windows on the east & west elevations be substituted instead, 7/22/68.

Inf. 236	2901 M St., NW Theodore & James Pedas	Build 1-story commercial bldg.-four new schemes, 2 elevations each.

ACTION: Recom. further study of scheme No. 4 consisting of a series of arched openings on M & 29th Sts. eleva tions. In addn. to the approach indicated in this scheme, also make a study omitting keystones, small-paned windows, & moulded cornice. Recom. further study of loading-dock door possibly recessing the door. Request subm. of site plan, fl. plan & section with next subm., 7/22/68.

237	2733 "O" St., NW Mr. Maughn Gould	Install light fixture at front entr.

ACTION: No obj., 7/22/68.

238	3252 Q St., NW Mrs John Blair	Remove porch, build new stoop to front door. Shorten basem. areaway. Add shutters. Paint. Lower front yard.

ACTION: Recom'd. subj. to omission of shutters on 1st fl. window. 2nd fl. shutters to be hung on hinges. New stoop & stair to be constructed of brick. Request subm. of revised design & include details of wrought-iron railing, 7/24/68.

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
239	1685-35th St., NW Richard Green	Constr. brick ret. wall 38" high. 7' wood & brick fence. Remove wood porch & constr. brick steps. No increase in size.

ACTION: No obj., provided design & workmanship match stairway shown in photos. accompanying appl., 7/24/68.

OG 69-

1	1329 Wisc. Ave., NW Georgetown Grill	1-story masonry storage ancillary bldg.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided exterior of addn. is brick or stucco, 7/22/68.

2	3059 M St., NW Farnsworth Reed, Ltd.	1 s-f, 20 sq-ft sign. 12" gold leaf plywood letters.

ACTION: No obj. to exist. sign, 7/22/68.

3	1222-26 Wisc. Ave., NW Don C. King (Commr'l.)	1 s-f, 24 sq-ft sign.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Text of signs in Georgetown to be limited to identification of business. No advertising permitted, 7/22/68.

4	3261 K St., NW Wilkins Rogers Milling Co.	Repaint sign. "Wilkins Rogers" to be removed. Sign painted on side of structure. 3320 sq-ft approx.

ACTION: No obj. to repainting & to changing text of exist. sign reading "Home of Washington Flour" to "Home of Washington Fine Baking Products", provided that "Home of Fine Baking Products" be rendered in the same character ltr. as the word "Washington", i.e., the addition of serifs. Request resubm. of drawings, 7/22/68.

NO OG 69-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
5	1054-31st St., NW Canal Square Associates	Rev. to prev. appl. to remodel exist. warehouse.

ACTION: Recom. further study of elevations on Canal & 31st Sts. Suggest low addn. on western end be differentiated in character. On 31st St. elevation, recom. that scale of middle bldg. be restudied, 7/22/68.

6	2707 Dumbarton Ave., NW Elizabeth Powers	Cut 28" x 14" opening under window over main entr. door for air cond. unit to be installed flush with front wall.

ACTION: No obj. provided air cond. unit is relocated to side of bldg., 7/24/68.

7	3800 Reserv. Rd., NW Georgetown U.	New Heating & Cooling Plant.

ACTION: No obj. to revised site plan provided that add'l. screen planting be located on the southern border of the parking lot & that sloped embankment to the north & east of the bldg. also be heavily planted. Request subm. of landscape scheme, 7/24/68.

8	1805 Wisc. Ave., NW Riggs Nat'l. Bank, Trustees	Constr. new 20' addn. length of present bldg. & remodel. exist facade.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest simplified approach to revisions & addn. to bldg., AUG 2 1968

10	1633 Wisc. Ave., NW United Democrats for Humphrey	1 s-f, 25 sq-ft tempo. sign.

ACTION: No obj. to tempo. sign for the duration of the campaign. Sign to be located across face of columns, 7/19/68.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 6/4/68

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
51	40 Ivy St., SE Henry Pratt	New addn. in rear ofexist. bldg. & apply "Huntercomb by Hunter" aluminum siding to exist. bldg. (color white).

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Incl. drawings to show proposed addn. & its relation to exist. structure, 4/30/68.

52	7115-16th St., NW Prudential Constr. Co.	New brick, c. b. & part frame dwell.

ACTION: Ret'd. for accurate 1/8" scale site plan showing exact location of exist. trees & those to remain. Show contours at 2' intervals of present site & how these would be changed. Also see prev. action on SL 68-42, 5/27/68.

53	627 Penna. Ave., NW Mark Weiss Camera Ctr.	1 s-f, 25 sq-ft sign with metal cut-out ltrs., using vertical upper-case ltrs., & concealed tubing behind the ltrs.

ACTION: App'd., provided frame is flat black or bronze, 5/28/68.

Inf. 55	2101 E St., NW American Foreign Service Assn.	NEW: Constr. 2-story addn. in alley to rear of exist. bldg. EXIST: Enlarge entr. door at E St. & mount 2 twin-lighting fixtures flanking door.

ACTION: App'd., 5/10/68.

56	2268 Cathedral Ave., NW Robert A. Colville	Roof porch to be removed. Remove wood floor porch & replace with concrete & face it with brick.

ACTION: No obj. to removal of roof or concrete fl. replacement. Subm. details of exact rail. proposed & show how 2nd fl. opening above door is to be treated, 5/17/68.

58	2270 Cathedral Ave., NW Richard W. Keyes	Remove roof over porch & replace wood floor porch by reinforced concrete faced with brick.

ACTION: No obj. to removal of roof or concrete fl. replacement. Subm. details of exact rail. proposed & show how 2nd fl. opening above door is to be treated, 5/17/68.

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
59	2527-35 M St., NW M St. Auto Center	1 s-f, 25 sq-ft free-standing sign on 2 posts. Yellow ltrs. on black bckgd.
ACTION:	App'd., provided poles are behind the sign & do not extend above it. Recom. white ltrs., 5/28/68.	
60	8500 East Beach Dr., NW Mr & Mrs Andrew D. Bryant	New dwelling.
ACTION:	App'd. Subm. brick sample, 5/28/68.	
61	200 Md. Ave., NE Veterans of Foreign Wars	Set new marble in bldg. & erect new screen wall in marble.
ACTION:	App'd., 5/28/68.	
54	3908 Shoemaker St., NW Gerard M. La Vay	Erect residence. Brick.
ACTION:	App'd. Request subm. of landscaping plan & brick sample, 6/4/68.	
57	901 thru 947 - 6th St., SW Southwest #12 Corp.	Constr. 434 dwell. units, of which 414 units will be elevator served. Highrise apts. & 20 units will be single-family twnhou
ACTION:	App'd., 6/4/68.	
63	1729-35 New York Ave., NW AIA	Hqtrs. Bldg. for AIA.
ACTION:	Disap'd. Recessed notch between wings unacceptable. Request restudy & resubm. of design, 6/18/68.	

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
64	401 L'Enfant Plaza Centre, SW L'Enfant Plaza Corp.	L'Enfant Plaza - West Bldg.

ACTION: App'd., provided final working drawings are submitted showing finished details. Show mechanical equipment on roof & sides of bldg. Erect material sample on site for approval, 6/20/68.

62	600 New Hamp. Ave., NW Watergate Improvement Assn.	Stage IV, Bldg. 1. 12-story high rise off. bldg.

ACTION: Conditionally app'd. for prel. siting, massing, & general design. Omit simulated "railing" projections on spandrel panels & resubmit detailed working drawings for final approval. Details of all exposed mechanical equip. & material samples to be included, 6/18/68.

don't we ask them?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes

MR. WALKER: Let's get moving.

(Discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They are coming in. We will ask them the question.

MR. ATHERTON: That is it. That is building number one.

CHAIRMAN WALTON:Now we are going to move that all off. We will ask those questions when they come in, because they are coming in.

We will go into the whole RLA group now, Charlie.

MR. ATHERTON: Okay.

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D. C. Redevelopment Land Agency and General Services Administration

(a) Proposed development of Parcels 19 and 20 in Southwest Washington

MR. BUNSHAFT: There is at least one member of the press. Is this to be executive session?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, it is executive.

Preliminary site study. You are involved, Cloethiel? In this group?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, the second one. But I can stay for the first, can't I?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. I'm trying to get you out.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, I am getting to be a little hurt.

(Laughter)

MR. ATHERTON: Do you want to have them come in now?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. ATHERTON: This will be the first one, the Ventura group.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Okay. We are going to let him talk for a little bit or we are going to be in trouble on this. Then I am going to ask a couple of you to give our opinion.

(Discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good morning.

MR. ATHERTON: Gentlemen, this is Mr. Ventura, spokesman for this project.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Fine. Will everybody else be seated wherever they wish.

MR. VENTURA: We have one model missing I think we would like to include.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Oh, yes. We had it out earlier.

MR. VENTURA: May I first introduce my partner and associates.

(Introductions)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Fine.

MR. VENTURA: I am pleased to be able to present our design this time, because I think that it involves an entirely different philosophy from that which much modern

architecture is judged, I think different from that by which by which this scheme was analyzed last time, at the last meeting.

I might mention, first, what we feel not appropriate, what we feel inappropriate for this site.

This model shows the neighborhood, this being Maryland Avenue (indicating), this being Sixth and Seventh Streets, and this being C Street.

The model as it is includes our building, which is an office building, and I will assume all of you know in general the program.

Now, I will point out briefly at first what we do not intend to do, what we do not intend to do or what we don't approve of doing, and that is putting one simple block on this site.

We feel that this building does not necessarily have to be one simple discreet geometric shape. It does not have to have thereby one scale. It does not have to be a building which is a whole in itself, discreet and separated from the other buildings around it. It does not have to sit in a sapce; it can be a building which makes urban space around it.

If I may, I would like to come back in a little more detail to these ideas.

But I think these illustrations might also help illustrate this entirely different philosophy, as I will call it, which is the issue here for our building.

This early plan for Washington, the L'Enfant plan, this early print of 1800, significantly indicates the city as a texture where the majority of the streets are corridors, so to speak, and where the buildings come right up to the sidelines and define the street as a corridor. This is the typical tissue. And then, significantly, in the L'Enfant plan, the important buildings, there is a hierarchy here; the buildings which are more important and which are more monumental -- the Capitol and the White House, essentially -- are sitting free in space, independent of this overall tissue.

Significantly, again, the shadows on this plan indicate the original intention, and this is the traditional urban texture at the Eighteenth Century scale.

This sketch indicates the center of Washington without streets, just showing form and spaces. It is significant that on the Pennsylvania Avenue side, especially with the so-called Federal Triangle, these buildings traditionally were designed in this manner (indicating) where they take the diagonal of Pennsylvania Avenue, and in the new plan for Pennsylvania Avenue, pretty much this tradition is perpetrated. These buildings go along the Avenue emphasize the Avenue. They also thereby give direction towards the dome of the Capitol.

It is not incidental that you orient, when you are on that street, to the Capitol.

It is significant also that the buildings along the Mall come rightly I think -- individual, discreet buildings, because they are more important buildings; because of their position on the Mall, they are independent. They are built independently and they give a sense of hierarchy and richness to the scene, scale and contract, which are appropriate and which are at home -- if amplified, are at home with the original intention of L'Enfant.

This is the approach in a city like Paris where the Madeline -- these buildings are independent objects, the average building, row house or row building. (Indicating)

When you come to this side, you see the situation is neither/nor. You have buildings which are independent, which are much larger in scale from the original texture, and which have this amorphous, uncomfortable space surrounding them. That is very much the character of the site around our building.

You are in a kind of no man's land You are in a kind of Los Angeles City form -- anti-traditional. It is anti-urban. The spaces are even, at least in Los Angeles; the spaces are parking lots. They have some use perhaps, the space where an individual can walk through.

Therefore, our approach was to make a building which was not just a discreet object in space, but which was a fragment in the total texture, which did not imply that it was one of these monuments, although in some ways we do relate to the

situation which already exists there.

Before I get back to this in detail, I might refer to a few other historical examples which I think are relevant.

This is a plan of a typical hotel in Paris, Seventeenth Century. You have here indicative an approach which again parallels ours I think, and it is one where the architect accepted the contingencies and the circumstances and the particular circumstances of the site. He had a very irregular site, as we do in our case; a very cockeyed and unsympathetic, in one way, setting. And he had to put in it his classical architecture, rather complex program that involved symmetry and balance. By ingenuity he was able to do this.

He accepted this challenge. He did not say let's change the program, let's tear the buildings down around it. By this, I think he got a kind of rich architecture which he might not have gotten in such a pure -- if he had been more purist in his approach.

Also I think you recognize even these hotels, important house or important person, it is still a part of the fabric of the city. It was not one of the major buildings.

Alto, the Finnish architect, is one who works in this tradition. He has the Pension Building in Helsinki. When he has a site which involves diagonals, he sometimes shapes the building diagonally. But when that does not work in terms of the interior, he uses the jagged, if you wish, profile

which does follow the interior rectangularity of the spaces. So he has a building which, in its motif, includes the diagonal and the rectangular.

The idea of the interior court, which we have used in our building, I would like to submit is also one which has a tradition, and one which is appropriate. The Cour de Leur of the hotel is one, again; the open space which is enclosed, which is semi-private and semi-public, which is a space which is more comfortable for the pedestrian in this neighborhood.

The idea of the res ding walls, where the space gets smaller in scale and size as you approach the center, is one that is traditional in a Jacobi. (Indicating)

To refer also to the fact that our building is not one pure form, and the fact it is both high and low -- which we have accepted as this architect did, accepted (indicating) -- this is a traditional which you find in any building which has a hierarchy of forms and spaces. Mount Vernon has it. Castel Howard has it. The lower buildings which were smaller and which built up to the larger, more important building in the back. Also with the space. I think there is an analogy.

It is very significant that the fenestration in this design is the same in the low and the high portions where it isn't here. (Indicating) I might come back to that.

I also refer to the size of this building. This is a

large space. This is an enormous scale site. And when you apply our building plan to those (indicating), we all know that our court -- the opening of the court is approximately, in width, the same as the piazza, which is not a court but which is a piazza space between those. Also approximately the size of the narrower end of this (indicating).

If I may again, I would like to refer now more specifically to this site.

I would like to return in more detail to the site and to the building. I would say that there were in the building two main sets of determinants. Those are the program itself of the building and those of the site, of the outside character. I will be referring mostly to the outside character.

I feel that if this building does have the single simple shape, that what will result almost inevitably is a space which will be too big and where the pedestrian will feel uncomfortable, and that we will really be making a kind of specious and too -- this is very unified (indicating). Obviously we are doing exactly what the other buildings in the neighborhood have done.

This looks rather neat, rather good from an airplane, as we are seeing it in a model, but this building (indicating) essentially must look right from down below and must go comfortably.

So by having the lower buildings, we do permit a

greater richness of space. We do, by following this in a traditional manner, orient towards the Capitol. By having a lower building in front, we recognize small and large, and we make forms where the individual can be comfortable.

These little dots here are cars and indicate the enormous size of this site

Now, to get back to the program, I will not dwell much longer on --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Please don't, because, you know, we have been over this in great detail, both this morning and at previous meetings. Do not act as though it is our first glimpse of this. We are very familiar with the program and all of the details on it.

MR. VENTURA: I appreciate that.

I would mention that the main considerations were the subway station, which will be there (indicating), and which will at this point presumably generate a good deal of pedestrian activity.

There is the easement which we all know about. We accepted this easement. It will cost more money to remove it.

We would rather use that money for architectural purposes, to enhance the quality of the building, which we would save by not moving the things.

At the same time, in the manner of this plan, which does accommodate scales of carriage and pedestrian, work

beautifully in the same building. We like the idea of having an echo in our superblock of the original L'Enfant scale in Washington and by keeping this as a private road, an echo of the former, we are able to enrich this thing by combining these two scales and giving greater richness to this building; also convenience for people being brought up to the building.

This is a matter I think of some question to some people, the fact that these -- again, this is a question of expediency, of enlightened expediency we think; again, in the tradition of the former city approach.

Always in the past, architects who built in cities had to accommodate to the regular sites -- Rome and Paris is full of this -- on the diagonal. What often gives real richness to those buildings, which are works of art, is the possibility of breaking the pure order, of breaking it not out of weakness but out of strength. And we feel this facade becomes more pure and this building becomes a more successful entity by once in a while giving in to a particular circumstance of that sort. (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think we have been over it rather thoroughly.

MR. VENTURA: Mr. Chairman, may I make one more comment concerning the shops, which is important?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. VENTURA: We feel very strongly that inclusion of the commercial in this program in a bold way, of the 12,000 square feet, is very important and we are sympathetic to this idea. We believe it is very important that a good amount of shopping be included in this area for the convenience of the neighborhood and also for the vitality. It is especially appropriate because it increases pedestrian movement, which will be here because of the subway, and we accept the idea of showing the shopping. We think it should not be hidden below grade, which is possibly questionable from the standpoint of merchandising-- the pink is the shopping in the lower floor. (Indicating)--but that it be appropriate for the sense of vitality and activity and interest it gives to this neighborhood, and -- frankly, so that you won't be bored when you walk down the street as you are bored sometimes.

We tried to indicate here that we will combine the activity, the variety of the commercial, the lower portion; at the same time, the commercial is confined very much within architectural limits, with architectural heights. So you have both. And in this scheme, again, you have the contrast of the rigid, somewhat monumental character of the whole and the control of it; and then you have the opportunity within it for the activity of the commercial below.

What else have I left out?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't think you left a thing out.

Don't try to think of new things.

We have asked Mr. Bunshaft to be the spokesman for us. He will tell you what we think.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think if words could build a building, you would have a beautiful building. But what we object to is nothing you have said; what we object to is the very ordinariness of this thing (indicating). It is very dull, ordinary, hackneyed -- won't make this beautiful.

MR. VENTURA: We worked very hard to make this building look ordinary in--

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are not interested in ordinary buildings. You have done enough speeching; we don't need a course in history here either. We are not illiterate.

This is a very ordinary project and that is what we object to.

And talking about spaces will not make it beautiful.

Words are easy. Building a good building is very hard. This is not a good building under any pretense or babel about words.

Christ Almighty, you don't have to get out -- ridiculous!

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Leave the lecture out.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The thing we object to is the ordinariness of it.

You are insulting Alto to bring this into this thing.

Alto -- sure, he steps back, but he doesn't take the damn motif and setback -- u usually has a void.

MR. VENTURA: May I --

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are stuck, because you don't know how to solve a triangular site.

Anyhow, this is a Commission and we are not here to have a bull session about future of architecture; we consider this very ordinary and won't approve it.

MR. VENTURA: Sir, do you still consider it ordinary after what I have said?

MR. BUNSHAFT: What you have said hasn't got the slightest effect on this, because what we judge is with our eyes, not what you say. We are not here for a salesman's speech.

MR. VENTURA: Judge the whole building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Here is a model. We can judge it.

MR. VENTURA: I think words are needed.

MR. BUNSHAFT: All the plans in Paris couldn't make this building needed.

MRS. VENTURA: We need philosophy of the project.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am sorry, I am running this Commission.

MRS. VENTURA: Excuse me, Mr. Walton.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You cannot interrupt and interject

philosophic arguments. We are discussing a specific project--and I am going to keep control of the meeting.

MRS. VENTURA: If I may address you, may we get other reactions from other members of the Commission?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have chosen Mr. Bunshaft as our spokesman.

I still am running the proceedings of this Commission and intend to.

The Commission has been polled. When I want to call on a member of the Commission, I will call on him.

I want that absolutely clear.

Would you go ahead, Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, now I was supposed to take the rap for all the disapproval, but it isn't done that way. In fact, most of the time we listen to people just out of courtesy, because we spend a great deal of time on these jobs, usually a day or a week before, or morning before. So we are not just walking in casually and looking at this.

I have had more baloney about this project -- this is Washington. This is an opportunity to do a good building. And this is not a good building. You can talk til you are blue in the face -- in fact, it proves the art of talking and the art of doing are two separate things. When you get through with talking, that is only the means. The end is the good building, what we call a good building -- bad, old, whatever we

[illegible]

[illegible]

MRS. VENTURA: [illegible]

[illegible]

CHAIRMAN VENTURA: [illegible]

[illegible]

I will [illegible]

and intend to.

The Commission has been [illegible]

call on a member of the Commission; I [illegible]

I want [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. SHERRATT: [illegible]

[illegible]

fact, most of the [illegible]

because [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

I [illegible]

in Washington. This is an [illegible]

And this is not a good building. [illegible]

in the face [illegible] in fact, [illegible]

[illegible]

with talking, [illegible]

building, what [illegible]

are, we are the judges in this case.

In fact, if you listen to the words, you would expect something quite unusual and marvelously unusual.

We welcome something unusual in design -- not unusual in words.

There is nothing unusual about this. In fact, it is dull. That is our real concern; it is dull. It isn't a difference of philosophy; it is a difference of conversation.

Here is a building you can say is different from this (indicating). You could give arguments whether this is good or bad, but it is a building.

This (indicating) is dull.

And this is not my opinion alone; the other members would probably not say this, frankly. That is why -- I mean they might say it kinder and maybe Mr. Sasaki ought to say it; but if you listen carefully, it will come out the same way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki.

MR. SASAKI: Yes. I think it is obvious, Mr. Ventura is very eloquent and he knows his history, and so forth. But there seems to be something basically wrong with your analysis where, if you have the one remaining site where all the other buildings have already been fixed -- wouldn't you adjust your buildings to the other and not try to recreate an entire environment?

[illegible]

Indeed, if one looks at [illegible]

something quite unusual [illegible]

[illegible]

in [illegible].

There is no [illegible] [illegible]

small. This is one [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible]

[illegible] is a [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] (Indeed[illegible]). [illegible]

[illegible] to [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]

This (indeed) is [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

MR. VENTURA: I would certainly agree with that.

MR. SASAKI: Isn't that the situation?

MR. VENTURA: I would say we have done both. We have been analogous in many ways to the existing buildings, because we have this parallel going in the same way. (Indicating)

On the other hand, I think we have tried to be contrasting and analogous. We have tried to be unified and not unified.

If I may say something about the facades, I did not get to that because it seemed to me the spacial -- the high versus the low aspects of the building was being criticized.

MR. BUNSHAFT: More ordinary buildings are built with high and low. You act like you are discovering three stories and eight stories. I don't know what you are talking about.

MR. VENTURA: This building, it is significant the material we are anticipating is marble. It is white and connects in that way with the existing buildings, the majority of which are white marble.

MR. SASAKI: But, Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked this question is Mr. Ventura hit us over the head so hard at the introduction about the lack of validity of the other point of view. It seems to me, because you are given a set of circumstances, design circumstances, environmental circumstances, urban circumstances, whatever you want to call it, then you

would work -- you, as a designer, would work within that. You really would accept the frame of reference, because that is what you said in your talk.

So now it seems to me that any one of the other two schemes, the long building or the square one, would perhaps meet more the criteria that you yourself set in your discussion.

MR. VENTURA: I don't quite see that, because--

MR. SASAKI: Well, I think you can if you look at this model here, because your building is going to fit right about here (indicating).

Now, these are all existing buildings. This exists, this exists, this, this, this; also this (indicating). So you have one site to fill up.

Now, it seems to me it would be entirely wrong in attitude and philosophy, if you will, to do something so egocentric there.

You yourself said good architects ought to be willing to accept the site. So I am just taking your particular point of view and your contentions.

So I am saying that the square building here or a long building probably would be more suitable in the frame of reference, because you have a square building here (indicating), you have a square building with a space. So, in scale and so forth -- instead of fighting this.

Now, so we can take the point of view that -- because

you said that this is all rather stupid -- we inherited this as a Commission, so we have to work within the framework of it.

MR. VENTURA: To do both. I think where it is appropriate to follow what is there, we do; and that, in a sense, is what we do with the ordinariness of the building, if you will. It is anonymous.

I would rather say it is anonymous and a building which -- well, anonymous is not inappropriate. And so, in that way, we are analogous; as I say, in the general shape and direction of the building we are analogous.

Also we are that way because it fits the program where a squarish building does not fit the program well for interior spaces.

At other levels we are contrasting. I think unity can come from contrast and similarity. I think we have a combination of both.

We are not saying "nuts" to the existing situation; we are accepting it and trying to enhance it at the same time and make this building a fragment of the neighborhood.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Smith, do you have anything to say?

MRS. SMITH: You had a drawing with a square building. Could you --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is down on the floor.

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

I [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

MRS. SMITH: Could you explain why that couldn't meet the program or even possibly recognizing the angle of the site? (Indicating)

MR. VENTURA: Yes. I would say it is inappropriate, again, because this increases the no-man's-land quality here.

To me, this would be a vast space with a couple little benches trying to be human and not succeeding.

At the same time, you continue this amorphous 1984 quality of space.

At the same time, the square building is quite awkward -- this is the height; we have to retain the 90 foot height. It is amorphous and ambiguous in form.

You have much too much interior space here for an office building, and it is important that this is a private office building and not GSA, so it has to have standards that would allow for more interior space connected with height.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki.

MR. SASAKI: Could you put the other-- yes, that one.

You say this one doesn't meet your program requirement as much as this one (indicating). The square footage, I imagine you can absorb all of this in one mass, couldn't you, by making it thicker?

MR. VENTURA: We can if we -- we were given a minimum-maximum for the high building and we have made this maximum development. The developer has found maximum development of

the program in the financial planning of it.

What this represents is just our building, which is the maximum development alone, and so we have had to keep out all of the low area here. (Indicating)

MR. SASAKI: Let me see whether I can follow this questioning.

MR. VENTURA: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: This configuration represents your total program, the requirements permitted under the urban renewal design? (Indicating) Regulation?

MR. VENTURA: That is right.

MR. SASAKI: Now, I think we discussed this at the last Commission meeting and we felt as though in this particular case, where it is the last building to complete this area, the renewal design controls of the renewal legislation ought to be re-examined to give you more freedom.

We realize this is difficult. The issues that are involved here seem to warrant this kind of-- Now, this may give you a completely new opportunity to look at the building entirely and put it all under one envelope.

Now, we know, let's just say we must not argue about whether or not this kind of involved configuration is good or bad. You can always do that in another situation. Maybe we would really buy it.

I think that in your discourse here, you are quite

right about this part where they made the corridor important; but then you have to realize all of these were the same height to get this unity. Paris is done almost entirely this way.

You always argue you want a little of both. I think you fall between two different schools.

So if you look at this side, as I said, you have to accept the notion that this is the character, the spirit over here. (Indicating)

So you have this one last building to put in there, and so I think you ought not to fight it in the same sense this architect didn't fight this site. (Indicating)

MR. VENTURA: Very good. The program changes--

MR. SASAKI: May I say one more thing, Mr. Chairman? Because I think we discussed this in the Commission.

We thought in terms of general massing, this would be preferable to this (indicating); and the reason for this is this building is in existence (indicating), which is shown in this model. You see, it is kind of reflective. These buildings are of this nature, so something of this sort -- even larger -- wouldn't be bad (indicating).

I think Mr. Bunshaft mentioned the possibility of splaying the side to again reflect this (indicating). So again we are not saying it has to be just a box or cube, so we shouldn't be putting words in your mouth. You are the designer. You ought to take it from that particular point of view.

right would only [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
but then you have to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
to use this [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
you [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

So if you [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
accept the notion that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] (Indicating)

So you have [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
and so I think you [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

MR. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
Because I think [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
be [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] (Laughing).
This building is [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] -- [illegible] [illegible] (Laughing).

I think [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
again [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
You [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

I think the nature of the problem you have inherited here, you have three clients, RLA, your own developer-client, and you have us as a client. So somehow you put the power structure in this particular section here-- Mr. Chairman, I suspect we have power with the proper priorities at the moment.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What is the distance from here to here (indicating)? Roughly.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It would be the same.

MR. VENTURA: Our building is 400 feet, so that is about -- over 400 feet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What does this line mean, setback? (Indicating)

MR. VENTURA: That is the setback, yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What is it from here? (Indicating)

MR. VENTURA: From here to here (indicating) is about 410 feet. That is about 400.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is how high? (Indicating)

MR. VENTURA: Ninety feet is the limit.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So if you wanted to make a massive-- I know you don't want to, but you could have a building that almost filled the whole site with a court in it. Ninety feet isn't very big. You could do whatever you like. But you could have a terminous to this (indicating), if one wanted to follow the old planning of Washington -- not a square, but you could have a building that related to the streets and acted as

I think you should be the president and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] you have three children, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and you have me be a [illegible]. So [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

a terminous for this space in here (indicating), if one wanted to. I am not saying that you wanted to.

MR. VENTURA: It would be a very thin building, very thin thing to keep within--

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, at one end it should be thick. I don't know what the end thickness of this building is. You could have all the shops you want, with garden and all that, within it. But it is old fashioned.

What is the thickness of that building?

MR. VENTURA: Ninety feet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You could have a building, you could have your elevators and groupings-- I am not trying to do it for you. But the problem is here, this Commission is not approving this, I believe -- is that right, Sasaki? You say it so sweetly.

MR. SASAKI: I think that seems to be the sense of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If no one has any other comment, we are through. Thank you very much.

MR. VENTURA: Thank you.

V. 1. b. Proposed Building across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks adjacent to east side of Tenth Street Mall, FOB 5, and L'Enfant Plaza - Preliminary Site Study

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Who is on this?

MR. ATHERTON: The project to the east of Prospect Park.

a terminous for this [illegible] (inaudible), if you [illegible] to. I am not saying [illegible] you [illegible].

MR. VENTURA: It would be a very thin building, very thin thing to keep within--

MR. SUNSHAFT: Well, by one [illegible] I don't know [illegible] the [illegible] of this building [illegible] could have all the [illegible] [illegible] within it, but it is [illegible].

What is the [illegible] of that building?

MR. VENTURA: [illegible].

MR. SUNSHAFT: You could have a building, you could have four elevators and [illegible]-- I am [illegible] for you. But the problem is [illegible] Commission [illegible] approving this, I believe -- is that right, [illegible] it so [illegible].

MR. [illegible]: I think [illegible] the Commission.

CHAIRMAN [illegible]: It [illegible] we are [illegible]. Thank you very much.

MR. VENTURA: Thank you.

[illegible]

CHAIRMAN [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. ROSZAK: Also they are insecure in their judgment about it. There are exceptions.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now we had better do the AIA.

Thank you.

MR. PASCO: Send me a personal letter, Ted. I would appreciate it. This will be a help.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We were talking on this meeting, this Ventura thing. These two people from RLA were sitting here. That is fine. I am glad they heard. I am delighted in this case.

V. 2. b. American Institute of Architects - Revised Design of Headquarters Building

MR. ATHERTON: How about this as far as the press is concerned?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Did we have the press in the last time?

MR. ATHERTON: I don't think they have been through the whole thing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think we ought to have them today.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, keep them out.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Sasaki, you are going to present this one.

MR. SASAKI: I would say Mrs. Smith.

Exhibit T

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

about it. There are [illegible] lines.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: [illegible]

Thank you.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

Appreciate it. This will be a [illegible].

CHAIRMAN WALTON: [illegible]

MR. BURNSHAFT: [illegible]

Venture thing. There are people from [illegible]

That is fine. I am glad [illegible]

case.

V. 2. [illegible]

MR. ATHERTON: [illegible]

is concerned.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: [illegible]

time.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

the whole thing.

MR. BURNSHAFT: [illegible]

today.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: [illegible]

MR. BURNSHAFT: [illegible]

one.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MRS. SMITH: No architects should stay out of this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are the friend of everybody; you present it. I won't--

(Laughter)

MR. SASAKI: We haven't decided whether you are timid or brash.

MR. WALKER: I am afraid I would agree even with a compromise, but I will vote for it.

MR. SASAKI: I don't know what to say except ask about that crease in the middle.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are going to tell him?

MR. SASAKI: Ask.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Ask, then tell him.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: He is going to do it in his own Oriental way.

MRS. SMITH: Inscrutable.

(Laughter)

MR. MILLS: We will make this very brief, but I would like to announce at this time that this design that you see presented here today has been considered approved by the owners' representative; that is, the Headquarters Committee.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We wondered.

Mr. Giurgola.

MR. GIURGOLA: What you see really is not the presentation that we would like to submit to you, because of the

MRS. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

(Lengthwise)

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

CHAIRMAN [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

MRS. [illegible]: [illegible]

(Lengthwise)

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

CHAIRMAN [illegible]: [illegible]

MR. [illegible]

MR. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible]

fast date. Mostly it is represented in this model. The drawing really shows there are some additional studies.

What we worked more was -- one major criticism was around this hole here, this central element (indicating), which we now start to see the same idea of opening up these two floors (indicating), the lower floor and the mezzanine, toward the garden. We somehow reduced the size of that, found this direction (indicating) in the lower part, and establishing this other one, which carried into the elevator group over here (indicating). So this would be an open sort of recess to build this corner, with a glass in the face of the elevator shaft here on the corridor (indicating), and opening in the lower part, in section -- well, it is open here in this model (indicating). So we call it -- I thought we had a section.

In other words, like we see here in the model, it is a sloping glass roof on the entrance lobby.

We simplify the edge here on this side (indicating), still trying to maintain the kind of direction parallel to this strong edge here (indicating). We changed the situation of the stair to make -- closer to the building (indicating), as the entrance is through New York Avenue and would by-pass this side here (indicating) into the building. That is it pretty much.

The building is concrete definitely. We are thinking of the form work on the surface, let's say, which will be for

size to study it. Of course, in this model you wouldn't see that. We will follow the technology, plywood and plastic. Maybe size the joint of the building and so forth.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have asked Mr. Sasaki to speak for us.

MR. SASAKI: Yes.

I think a question I will ask you, you should think of more reasons now why you would like to, say, take your particular point of view. But the Commission members, in discussing it this morning, thought the center slit was still not resolved.

Now, we realize that you -- see, if we took this building in its entirety, we have certain playful, you know, events happening here (indicating) in contrast to the quieter plane, quite aside from this elevation here (indicating). So if you looked at this thing here, all of the lower things -- which is special function and so forth -- will give you an opportunity to get whatever manipulation you might want to.

Now then, what is your opinion in closing these four upper floors (indicating), and then getting rid of this part (indicating)?

We don't know how you would resolve that one, but that would be an opportunity for you to do something else So you would get, you might say, a simplification.

This level (indicating) would play up against the

[illegible] to which [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. [illegible]:

I [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
of more [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
particular point of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

Now, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

upper level. And then these elevations (indicating) I think we have seen before, and so forth. So if you would like to comment on that.

I think that expresses it, in general, the Commission members' feeling. I tried to say this.

MR. GIURGOLA: My feeling is this upward part already is strong enough to express the continuity of this office level, which somehow follows this kind of line (indicating).

The fact there is a fracture at this point (indicating) is that really there is a fracture in this building in this point (indicating).

What obviously we are afraid about this connection is that what one may call articulation, that point -- articulation really starts from below. And I would feel very bad to interrupt only at this point (indicating) so far as this is still, you know, new building. And you keep going inside and articulate all these joints.

What we are afraid, in a few words, is in joining this (indicating), this really becomes -- it becomes of such tremendous importance, turning point, and really nothing is there. This is just the window, which becomes sort of a paradoxical situation.

MR. SASAKI: Let me say -- as I listened to your reasoning, I take it as a personal view in large part, because as you look at the lower floor functions, there are reasons for

upper level. And [illegible] (indicating) I [illegible] we have seen before, [illegible] comment on that.

I think that [illegible] memory [illegible]

MR. [illegible] is strong enough to [illegible] level which [illegible] (indicating).

The fact [illegible] is that really there is a [illegible] point (indicating).

That [illegible] in the fact that one [illegible] tion really starts from [illegible] indicated only in that [illegible] (indicating) [illegible] still, you know, [illegible] articulate all these [illegible].

Now we can [illegible] this (indicating), [illegible] tremendous [illegible] there. This is [illegible] social situation.

MR. [illegible] reasoning. I [illegible] as you look at the [illegible]

this kind of articulation here (indicating), isn't there? Yes. Right at these two levels (indicating). But when you look at this floor (indicating), there is no reason for it. It could go through.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: So, in other words, you can argue persuasively for one view as for the other view as I interpret it.

MR. GIURGOLA: You argue the plan, the other elevations, if we close this (indicating), this would be a solid floor (indicating).

MR. SASAKI: That's right.

Let me ask this question. Now, you say this is a suggestion or not, but the thought has just occurred to me -- this has not been mentioned by the Commission members -- since you have five here and four here (indicating), if you did something, either made the last one or omitted this last one (indicating), then we would really read through -- you know, this level read through, even if there were a crack. That might simply simplify it even more. That is an intermediate point of view. I don't know whether your clients can see that.

This is the kind of thinking that-- I might say that is not the Commission's point of view.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are saying to carry one floor through down below?

MR. SASAKI: No. There is an eratic situation; four versus five. So I would make it four and four, to suggest the continuity; leave the crack in, but then change the lower floor.

I know it is more symmetrical, but you know what I mean, to give the sense of more continuity, and leave that gap there.

When you walk in from this direction, you have this very strong background effect, and in order to escape the severity we lifted this up a bit.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft, do you want to comment along the way?

MR. BUNSHAFT: We will discuss it afterward.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Smith?

MRS. SMITH: No; I think our greatest concern is the corner, and we can discuss it from that standpoint.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, if there are no more comments thank you very much for another appearance. We will take it under consideration. While we have got this model here, why don't we have some discussion. Let's shut the door.

MR. SASAKI: Because I was the spokesman for the Commission, I felt it was my obligation to say certain things. Now, if I could speak as an individual I would be inclined to accept this, and I would argue this way from Giurgola's point of view. I know that Gordon is going to clobber me on this argument.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I won't say anything. I am just going to vote.

MR. SASAKI: If you look at this elevation here, it has certain characteristics which are quite obvious. Now, if you look at this part it has a certain fragility in it. Now, if you carried this all over here that fragility will look

out of scale. If you bring it this way, this fragility versus this is not that bad and as he said there are certain things about this building that are characteristic of his style of design, and because I also served on the other Commission and I saw how some of the buildings were really clobbered because we picked on little details and did not judge the building in its entirety.

Now, certainly we can ask questions and criticize certain things but let Giurgola have his head. That would be my earnest plea here. Let us not just touch one element of it, and make our decision on that. If we are going to reject the building, let's do so in its entirety. But, I would be willing to accept the building in its entirety and that is my speech.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I will say something. I just can't be a party to that corner, and I will vote against this job.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right.

MR. WALKER: I will go along with Mr. Bunshaft.

MRS. SMITH: I don't know how to do it, I hasten to add, but I know that is not the way to do it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What is the problem about turning a corner? We do it every day without putting a notch in it. But, if he doesn't want to do it--

MRS. SMITH: It is such an odd notch.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am not quite sure what your

vote is.

MRS. SMITH: I think it ought to be closed.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: In other words, you want to reject this design.

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Roszak?

MR. ROSZAK: I was just wondering if we'd reject this design what we'd be getting into after that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We had this up for consideration before, and what Mr. Sasaki is saying reflects Giurgola's judgment. He should have been told to close that corner, and in so doing we would have gone along but not on any other basis. I can't go along with it this way.

MR. ROSZAK: Just from the standpoint of pure design this is bad.

MR. SASAKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I can make one more statement. We have to look at the logic of the structure, and also the logic of the notch. There is a rationalization if you look at it this way, and then I don't know what you'd call this but--

MR. BUNSHAFT: How can you talk about logic in a plan like that? You can't get from one wing to the other except with an Indian guide. Your oriental gentleness is failing. You have got the wrong group. Don't use the word logic for that plan.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You are with your colleagues.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It is the simple things that are hard to do, so you put gimmicks in it to make it 1968, June 1968.

MRS. SMITH: It will be '69 before we get around to it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We compromised before and, now, as far as I am concerned we won't compromise again and I am for voting it out and let them worry about what to do.

MR. SASAKI: The question I want to ask is are we voting against the notch or against the whole building? That ought to be clarified.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am voting against the whole building, because you asked him in such a way that he expressed himself that he wants the notch, and if he had been told that we wouldn't have approved it on that basis they would have decided what to do.

MR. ROSZAK: He could be taking the notch out.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, would you consider saying to him in our letter that if the notch were closed it would be approved?

MR. BUNSHAFT: With regard to the top four floors.

MR. SASAKI: That the building is being rejected on the basis of the notch which is not a satisfactory design.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The top four floors.

MR. SASAKI: It seems to me that in order to be fair to the clients, because I think the clients are really trying to come to a resolution; the architect has been rather cooperative, I think, and so I would like to give them a little more direction.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Would you agree to that?

MR. SASAKI: Accept the building on the basis of the notch being resolved.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Indicate that we disapprove of the principle of the notch.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The existence of the notch makes it impossible to approve the building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We won't approve it with a notch at that corner on the top four floors.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are unanimous; that's great.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You see all the time you wasted with your diplomacy?

MR. SASAKI: He may have a nicer feeling toward us, Gordon, and that is important.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Are the Watergate people here? Do you mind running until 1:30 in order to get everything done?

MR. WALKER: I can be here until half past 2:00.

MR. ATHERTON: The press also wants to know if they

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
4 June 1968

I. CONVENE, Room 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of next meeting
2. Approval of Minutes of April 1968 meeting
3. Expiration of term of Mario E. Campioli as Member of Board of Architectural Consultants
4. Policy Decision

III. LEGISLATION

S.2230-Bureau of the Budget Request-90th Congress

IV. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. Redevelopment Land Agency

   a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20, Maryland Avenue, 6th and 7th Streets, S.W.

   b. Proposed Building across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks

   c. L'Enfant Plaza - West Building

2. General Services Administration

   a. Proposed Area Study adjacent to Forrestal Building and South Agriculture Department Building

   b. Dormitory Building, Gallaudet College

   c. Philadelphia Mint - Selection of Artists for Proposed Sculpture

3. Department of the Navy

   Dispensary and Dental Clinic, Bolling/Anacostia

4. Department of the Army, Office of Chief of Support Services

a. Arlington Cemetery Guard Shelter

b. Proposed Lighting of National Amphitheater, Arlington Cemetery

c. Proposed Planting, Arlington National Cemetery Confirmation of Previously Approved Plans

5. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Bridge, Southern Avenue over Suitland Parkway

6. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Capitol East Playground and Natatorium - Revised Design

7. D.C. Government, Office of Beautification

Public Library - Planting of Trees

8. Treasury Department, Bureau of the Mint

Proposed Medal Commemorating the 250th Anniversary of the Founding of San Diego

9. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Old Georgetown Act

Appendix 2

Shipstead-Luce Act

a. Appendix 1

b. S-L 68-57, 901-947 6th Street, S.W., Apartments and Town Houses

c. American Institute of Architects - Revised Design of Headquarters Building

d. Watergate Project, Building #1, Stage 5

e. S-L 68-54, 3908 Shoemaker Street, N.W.

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency and General Services Administration

   a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in Southwest Washington

   b. Proposed Building across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks

   c. Proposed Area Study adjacent to the Forrestal Building and Agriculture Department by GSA

   d. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building

2. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

   a. S-L 68-57, Apartment Building townhouses, Maine Avenue

   b. American Institute of Architects-Revised Design of Headquarters Building

   c. Watergate Project, Building #1, Stage 5

3. Department of the Army, Office of Chief of Support Services

   Arlington Cemetery Guard Shelters

4. Freer Gallery of Art

   Inspection of Acquisitions